



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/873,481	06/04/2001	Douglas J. Kerkvliet	C535.12-0002	6544

164 7590 06/17/2003  
KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.  
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING  
312 SOUTH THIRD STREET  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55415-1002

EXAMINER

REDMAN, JERRY E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3634

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/873,481

Applicant(s)

KERKVLIT, DOUGLAS J.

Examiner

Jerry Redman

Art Unit

3634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 36-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 36-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 49, 52-54, 57, and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andresen in view of Stutzman. Andresen discloses an overhead door assembly comprising a door panel (10) having a bottom member (16), first and second vertical side members (18 and 20), and a top member (14), hinging support members (66, 70, 72, and 74) connected to a top portion of the door panel (10). Andresen fails to disclose a truss externally mounted on an outside face of a bottom horizontal end of the door panel (10). As shown in Figure 5, Stutzman discloses a truss (32) externally mounted on an outside face of a bottom horizontal end of the door panel (10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide extra support for a door panel bottom edge since the bottom edge of a door panel receives the greatest wear and tear on an overhead door system.

Claims 50, 51, 55, 56, 58, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andresen in view of Stutzman as applied to claim 49 above, and further in view of Wentzel. All of the elements of the instant invention are discussed in detail above except providing a weatherstripping around the periphery of the closure. Wentzel discloses an overhead door assembly with weatherstripping extending around the periphery of the closure. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the overhead door assembly of Andresen with

Art Unit: 3634

weatherstripping as taught by Wentzel since weatherstripping allows one to seal around and between an opening in a structure and the panel thereby sealing the building structure from the environment.

Claim 62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andresen in view of Belgium patent to D'Haveloose. All of the elements of the instant invention are discussed in detail above except providing a ground anchoring device. Belgium patent to D'Haveloose discloses a ground anchoring device having a plate, which mounts bolts to support vertical members. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide Andresen with a ground anchoring assembly as taught by d'Haveloose since bolts anchored to the ground improves the rigidity of the vertical support members.

Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andresen and D'Haveloose as applied to claim 62 above, and further in view of Mursinna. All of the elements of the instant invention are discussed in detail above except providing an operator in the form of a hydraulic cylinder, which opens and closes the door panel. Mursinna discloses a door assembly having a 3-way hydraulic cylinder, which operates the door to an opened and closed position. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide Andresen with an automatic door assembly as taught by Mursinna since an automatic door assembly allows one to easily operate the door to an open and closed position.

Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andresen, D'Haveloose, and Mursinna as applied to claim 63 above, and further in view

of Stutzman. Andresen fails to disclose a truss externally mounted on an outside face of a bottom horizontal end of the door panel (10). As shown in Figure 5, Stutzman discloses an truss (32) externally mounted on an outside face of a bottom horizontal end of the door panel (10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide extra support for a door panel bottom edge since the bottom edge of a door panel receives the greatest wear and tear on an overhead door system.

Claims 36, 38-41, 43-45, 48, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andresen in view of Mursinna and Stutzman. All of the elements of the instant invention are discussed in detail above except; 1) Providing an operator in the form of a hydraulic cylinder which opens and closes the door panel, and 2) Providing a truss externally mounted on an outside face of a bottom horizontal end of the door panel (10). Mursinna discloses a door assembly having a 3-way hydraulic cylinder, which operates the door to an open and closed position. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide Andresen with an automatic door assembly as taught by Mursinna since an automatic door assembly allows one to easily operate the door to an open and closed position. As shown in Figure 5, Stutzman discloses an truss (32) externally mounted on an outside face of a bottom horizontal end of the door panel (10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide extra support for a door panel bottom edge since the bottom edge of a door panel receives the greatest wear and tear on an overhead door system. With respect to claims 39 and 40, it would

have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the door operator to move the door panel to an opened and closed position in a time interval of 28-32 seconds since this time interval would be sufficient to allow one to move into or out an opening and would be a matter of design choice.

Claims 37 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andresen, Mursinna, and Stutzman as applied to claim 36 above, and further in view of Wentzel. All of the elements of the instant invention are discussed in detail above except providing a weatherstripping around the periphery of the closure. Wentzel discloses an overhead door assembly with weatherstripping extending around the periphery of the closure. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the overhead door assembly of Andersen with weatherstripping as taught by Wentzel since weatherstripping allows one to seal around and between an opening in a structure and the panel thereby sealing the building structure from the environment.


Claims 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andresen, Mursinna, and Stutzman as applied to claim 36 above, and further in view of d'Haveloose. All of the elements of the instant invention are discussed in detail above except providing a ground anchoring device. Belgium patent to D'Haveloose discloses a ground anchoring device having a plate, which mounts bolts to support vertical members. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide Andresen with a ground anchoring assembly as taught

Art Unit: 3634

by d'Haveloose since bolts anchored to the ground improves the rigidity of the vertical support members.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 36-64 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jerry Redman at telephone number 703-308-2120.

  
Jerry Redman  
Primary Examiner